



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/072,549	05/05/98	LUDWIG	L COLB001/22

CRAIG P. OFFERMAN  
COOLEY GODWARD  
3000 EL CAMINO REAL  
PALO ALTO CA 94306-2155

LM11/0201

EXAMINER

DINH, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2757

DATE MAILED:

02/01/99

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

**Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.                 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.                  |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____  |

**Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION**

1. ☒ Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-31 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner

EXAMINER'S ACTION

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --*

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

**Claims 1, 12-14, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Verhoeckx et al. US patent 4,005,265.**

As per claim 1, Verhoeckx teaches a video communication system comprising:

at least one analog video-signal source [abstract line 6];

at least one video display device [apparent];

at least one control communication component configured

to produce digital control-signals [abstract line 5 - signaling signals];

an unshielded twisted pair of wires [telephone wire]

defining a UTP communication path [col.20 line 20+],

arranged for video-signal transportation,

wherein the system is configured to

multiplex analog video-signals originate at one of the video-signal sources with digital controls from of the control communication component [lines 19-27 'via a single pair of cable'];

transmit the multiplexed signals along the UTP communication path to the at least one video display devices [apparent];  
use the control signals to control reproduction of video images, based on the video signals, on the one of the video displays [col.5 lines 17-35].

As per claims 12 and 21, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 1 above,

As per claims 13 and 14, Verhoeckx teaches multiplexing the audio and switching signal onto the UTP communication path [col.3 lines 19-27].

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

**Claims 21-26, 1-6, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tompkins et al. US patent 4,847,829 and further in view of Verhoeckx et al US patent 4,005,265.**

As per claim 21, Tompkins teaches

A video communication system for operation with an infrastructure including

at least one analog video-signal source [fig.2 camera];  
at least one video display device [fig.2 view finder 14]; and  
coaxial wire defining a communication path arranged for  
video signal transportation [col.3 lines 10-20],  
the system comprising:

(a) at least one control communication component [col.2 line  
67 'controller'] configured to, produce digital control-signals  
[line 57,68 'data communication']; and

wherein the system is configured to

- (i) multiplex [col.3 lines 10-28]
  - (1) analog video-signals,  
originating at a video-signal source,
  - (2) with digital control-signals  
from one of the control communication  
components,
- (ii) transmit the multiplexed signals
  - (1) along the communication path;
  - (2) to at least one of the video display devices;

Tompkins does not specifically teach using twisted pair communication path for transmission of the video. Tompkins preferred embodiment uses coaxial cable [col.3 lines 10-20]. Verhoeckx teaches transmission of video signal over existing

twisted pair wire to save cost [col.1 lines 20-25]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Verhoeckx with Tompkins to enable transmission of video conference signal over twisted pair instead of coaxial cable because it would have reduces cost. Verhoeckx teaches using digital control signal to control reproduction of video images at one of the video display devices [Verhoeckx col.3 lines 18-27].

As per claim 22, Tompkins teaches multiplexing analog audio onto the communication path [col.3 lines 10-20].

As per claim 23, Tompkins teaches controlling a switch to route the multiplexed signal along the communication path [col.3 lines 29-42].

As per claim 24, Tompkins teaches a server controlling the switch [col.3 lines 29-42 "network master"].

As per claim 25, it is inherent in the operation of Tompkins teaching that audio/video from a first station is configured to reproduce at a second workstation.

As per claim 26, Tompkins teaching using NTSC format. Hence it is apparent that the frames rate is greater than 20 frame/sec. Verhoeckx teaches the video images is reproduced at greater than 20 frames per second [col.7 line 32: 25Hz]. Hence, the system as modified in claim 21 would have greater than 25 frames per second.

As per claims 1-6, and 12-16, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 1-6 above.

**Claims 27, 7, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tompkins & Verhoeckx et al and further in view of Ramanathan "Optimal communication Architectures for Multimedia Conferencing in Distributed Systems".**

As per claim 27, Tompkins does teach combining video images to produce a mosaic image. Tompkins only enable one video source to be display at a time. Ramanathan teaches to create mosaic video image to reduce bandwidth to enable participant to see multiple video stream simultaneously in a teleconference system. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide mosaic creation means with Tompkins system because it would have enable the participant to see more than one of the other participants in the conference and enable better interaction of the participants.

As per claims 7 and 17, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 27 above.

**Claims 28, 8, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tompkins & Verhoeckx & Ramanathan et al**

**and further in view of Rangan et al. "Software Architecture for Integration of Video Services in the Etherphone System".**

As per claim 28, Tompkins does not teach a graphical user interface to enable selection of a user and the conference type. It is known in the art to provide selection of user and conference type [see Rangan et al.]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide graphical interface for the selection of user and conference type because it would have enable a user friendly and flexible initiation of a conference call.

As per claims 8 and 18, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 28 above.

**Claims 29-31, 9-11, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tompkins & Verhoeckx & Ramanathan et al and further in view of Stefik et al. "Optimal Communication Architectures for Multimedia Conferencing in Distributed Systems".**

As per claim 29, Tompkins does not specifically disclose a data conferencing along with the audio/video conferencing. Tompkins discloses that the system is capable of transmitting baseband data signals [col.6 lines 40-63] and can function in conjunction with standard data network (LAN). It is known at the time of the invention to provide data conferencing for

collaboration and problem sharing over a data network [see Stefik et al.]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a data collaboration tool with Tompkins system because it would have enable the user to collaborate and share data while using the audio/video conferencing.

As per claim 30, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have the data conferencing signal and video display on separate windows on the display device because it would have enable the user to have multiple view simultaneously. At the time of the present invention, it is known to have Operating System (e.g. Microsoft Windows, X-window, etc.) with built in capability for displaying multiple application windows. Hence, the user of this workstation inherently has the capability for displaying the data conferencing and audio/video conferencing in separate windows.

As per claim 31, it is apparent that the system as modified would display the data conference signal interactively at least two display devices [at the initiator and at least one other receiver].

As per claims 9-11, and 19-20, they are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 29-31 above.



Serial Number: 09/072,549  
Art Unit: 2757

-9-

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh  
Primary Examiner